

WRITTEN QUESTION E-2077/02
by Philippe Herzog (GUE/NGL)
to the Commission

Subject: Commission practices in connection with advisers ad personam

A high-level task force was set up in July 2001 to look at the current situation of advisers at the Commission and their future role. Its report of 14 November 2001 notes several management errors over the past two years. It also asks questions about the Commission's practices as regards ad personam advisers, pointing out that this is an unofficial job designation. It recommends that all the ad personam advisers (many of whom were heads of unit and/or advisers), as well as many of the present advisers, should be made into principal administrators or administrators hors classe.

1. On what specific basis does the Commission justify transferring officials from an official post to a personal post not recognised by the staff regulations?
2. On the basis of the information presented by the task force, it is possible that advisers and advisers ad personam have been, or still are, subject to professional and psychological harassment. Is the Commission not pressurising them into taking early retirement?
3. The task force report says that 'between half and two-thirds of the advisers perform tasks which are insignificant or ill-defined or needlessly duplicate work already done by the units'. What has the Commission done to ensure that these advisers and advisers ad personam are given responsibilities, including management posts, corresponding to their professional skills and experience? Has the Commission not compounded the problem by creating new adviser posts since the report was finalised?
4. Is the Commission prepared to initiate new analyses and consultation to solve the above management problems?